

Shelby Farms Parkway
Context Sensitive Solutions

SHELBY FARMS PARKWAY
ADVISORY TEAM
PARTNERING MEETING

February 10, 2005
Shelby Farms Visitor Center, Memphis, TN
David Lindeman, PE, Facilitator

Attendees

Resource Team

Laura	Adams
Larry	Brown
Brad	Corey
John	Dudas
Gregg	Elliott
Randy	Graves
Richard	Hollis
Larry	Jensen
Dan	Johnson
Keith	Kirkland
Marty	Lipinski
Steve	Reynolds
Charlie	Rond
Ritchie	Smith
Mark	Stansbury
David	Stevens
Barry	White

Government Staff

Ted	Fox
Wain	Gaskins
Martha	Lott
Michael	Oakes

Technical Advisors

Roger	Allan
Lisa	Reaney

Consultants

David	Lindeman
Gary	Sharpe
Bob	Kennedy
Steve	Hill
Nisha	Powers

Stakeholder Group

Friends of Shelby Farms Parks
County Commission, Shelby Farms Advisory Committee
Biking Association
Memphis Regional Chamber, Major Roads Committee
Community North of Farms
Ducks Unlimited
Agricenter
Memphis Tomorrow
Commuter through farms
Wolf River Conservancy
University of Memphis, Traffic Engineering
Baptist Healthcare
Sierra Club
Park Planner
Shelby Farms Board
Accredo Health
Brier Neighborhood Association

Organization

Shelby County Government
City of Memphis
Planning & Development
Shelby County Government

Organization

United States Army Corp of Engineers
Tennessee Department of Transportation

Organization

Palmer Engineering
Palmer Engineering
Palmer Engineering
Barge, Waggoner, Sumner & Cannon, Inc.
Barge, Waggoner, Sumner & Cannon, Inc.

Agenda

- 7:45 AM Sign-in, Coffee, Juice, and Pastries, Informal Team Building
- 8:00 AM Opening Comments – Sr. Representatives of Shelby County Government
– Sr. Representatives of City of Memphis
- 8:15 AM Getting Better Acquainted; Self Introductions - Facilitator
- 8:45 AM The Basic Principles of Partnering (Teamwork) – Facilitator
- 9:00 AM Project History – Shelby County Government
- 9:15 AM Create a Partnership Name – Group Exercise
- 10:00 AM Break
- 10:15 AM The Context Sensitive Solutions Process – Palmer Engineering
- 10:45 AM Project Design Parameters – Palmer Engineering
- 11:00 AM Create and Prioritize List of Critical Project Issues, Assign to Small Break-out Groups
and Begin Discussions – Group Exercise
- 12:00 PM Lunch Together
- 1:00 PM Continue Discussions of Critical Issues in Break-out Groups – Small Group Exercise
- 1:30 PM Summary Reports by Break-out Groups on Recommended Solutions or Action Plans for
Critical Project Issues – Group Exercise
- 2:00 PM Break
- 2:15 PM Discuss List of Team Goals and Reach Consensus – Group Exercise
- 3:15 PM Discuss Upcoming Steps and First Public Workshop - Facilitator
- 3:45 PM Closing Comments – Facilitator
– Sr. Representatives
- 4:00 PM Adjourn

Basic Principles of Partnering

Following brief self-introductions, the Facilitator made a brief presentation concerning the principles of partnering, team building, and reaching consensus.

Project History

Ted Fox, Shelby County Government, made a short presentation concerning the history of the project. Mr. Fox briefly described the various alternatives that had been considered in the past and how this project had evolved to its current status.

Questions From Resource Team Members

Following the project history presentation, the Resource Team was afforded opportunities to ask questions. The following are questions asked by the Resource Team followed by brief summaries of the answers given:

1. Is the road intended to be a “short cut” for commuters?

It was noted in response to this question that this project was not intended as a “shortcut” between I 40 and I 240. It also was discussed that the Context Sensitive Solutions concept has as its primary focus to foster public ownership in the project development process (“POP for Publicly Owned Project”). The focus of the Resource Team will be to hear and evaluate the various perspectives of the many stakeholders and interested groups and to make recommendations accordingly. Thus, this question cannot be answered with a simple “yes” or “no” response; although the original project concept was not for a “short cut” between I 40 and I 240.

2. Does our scope include looking at Walnut Grove Road, Sycamore View Road and Whitten Road?

We are starting with a blank page in terms of the scope of this project. An aerial photograph with the study boundary areas was displayed. Briefly, the study area extends from Walnut Grove to the South and Macon Road to the North. The limits of the study area are west of the Arboretum and east of the Lucius Burch Jr. Natural Area and the “911 Center.” Improvement of Whitten Road is identified within the proposed study area. The effect of and on Walnut Grove Road, Sycamore View Road, and Mullins Station Road will be considered in the overall project context. The current scope of this CSS process is such that improvements to Walnut Grove Road, Sycamore View Road, and Mullins Station Road outside the identified study area will not be the subject of recommendations on the part of the Resource Team. The project does include looking at connections to these roads within the study area.

3. Is there a Land Use Master Plan for the park?

There is not a Land Use Master Plan for the Park at this time.

4. Where are the City and County limits? Who owns what?

The County owns the park (designated for government use), but it is within the City Limits.

5. Where will Sycamore View Road be connected to Shelby Farms Parkway?

The ultimate recommendation regarding if or how Sycamore View Road connects to the Shelby Farms Parkway will evolve as the CSS process evolves and the project concept evolves.

6. How is the project being funded?

It is federally funded with a local match (80% Federal – 20% local).

7. Is our purpose to define the road?

The purpose of the Resource Team is to ensure that the full range of values and perspectives of the stakeholders is considered during the development of a recommended concept for the project.

8. Can a flood plain area be used for recreation?

Yes, floodplains can be utilized for some recreational activities if consistent with Federal and State policies.

9. Why should this process take 12 months?

The concept of Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) recognizes that a street, road, or highway, by the manner in which it is integrated into the community, can have impacts on the community. Defining and understanding the impacts and the effects on the community is essential to a successful CSS process. The CSS process must also complement and follow somewhat on a parallel path the process for compliance with NEPA.

Name for the Partnership

In the interest of building an effective team, the importance of the group selecting a team name was discussed. The group went through a brief team naming exercise. The following names for the team were considered:

Shelby Farms Parkway Team
Shelby Farms Parkway Task Force
Shelby Farms Parkway Access Team
Parkway Advisory Team
Shelby Farms Road Partners for Access
Shelby Farms Parkway Advisory Team
Shelby Farms Parkway Partners
Partners for Shelby Farms Parkway
Shelby Farms Citizens Advisory Team

The group went through an exercise to screen alternatives and reach consensus for a team name. Ultimately, the name **Shelby Farms Parkway Advisory Team** was selected.

The Context Sensitive Solutions Process

David Lindeman of Palmer Engineering gave a presentation describing what Context Sensitive Solutions are and how they will be applied to this project. The presentation included a description of the project meetings including anticipated dates for those meetings.

Project Design Parameters

Gary Sharpe of Palmer Engineering reviewed the design parameters for the project. Basically, the study area for the project is defined with a beginning point at the end of the Wolf River Bridge entering the west end of Shelby Farms and the ending at the intersection of Whitten Road and Macon Road. Mr. Sharpe described the other design parameters that the Team would consider including design speed, number of lanes, shoulder width and types, median type, access control, and grade separated vs. at-grade intersections. Possible enhancements for the project were introduced and the process of getting design exceptions from the FHWA was described.

Critical Project Issues

The group participated in an exercise where each attendee listed the top three (3) issues that they considered most critical to the development of the project. Entries were then grouped by common categories. Seven groups were identified as representative of comments from the group. The group titles and items listed under each title are as follows:

<p><u>TRAFFIC FLOW</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity • How much congestion will be tolerated? • Capacity / delay / level of service • Design and traffic flow • Traffic capacity • Adequate capacity • Traffic congestion • Reason – traffic alternative rather than thoroughfare • Design meets future needs (i.e., number of lanes) • Traffic flow • Number of lanes • Connectivity to existing roads • Relieve traffic congestion • Relieve traffic congestion on Walnut Grove • Time to navigate parkway • Impact on traffic flow • Creation of functional area network 	<p><u>GREAT DESIGN</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetic enhancements • Location – use of land • Road fits terrain and topography • Design fits in park setting • Location of parkway • Blend in • Parkway design that fits with the land • Seamless interface / enhancement to park aesthetics • Parkway design that enhances the park and provides access to it • Creative use of bridges • Keep focus on park usage and people – protect vision of “World’s best Urban and Region Park” • Maps and aerial photos of development before public meeting • No excessive cost • Context (Park) Sensitive
<p><u>PROTECT / ENHANCE PARK</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize impact on park visitor • Protection of park • Expedite completion of parkway • Protect views from Patriot Lake • Provide improved access to park • Impact on park activities (access, etc.) • Impact on park users • Preserve uses of park • Attractive road to enhance not detract from park • Ability to enhance the park • Impact to park (2) • How this project fits within a Master Plan • Impact on river and trail access • Impact of route on current park / usage 	<p><u>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality • Maintain traffic flow and lessen env. impact • Noise level • Mitigation of impacts to aquatic resources • Balance of env. and other public interest factors • Avoid traffic noise in Plough Park • Construction impacts (dust, noise, travel inconvenience) • Avoidance / Minimization of impacts to wetlands and streams • Minimize visual / ecological impacts

<u>EXTERNAL IMPACTS</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discourage use of road as short cut between I 40 and I 240 • Include focus on long-term effects of road outside of planning area • Not a substitute for existing interstate • Social impacts to surrounding neighborhood and community • Add value to park, local neighborhood and community • Views of divergent groups (recreational, commercial, political) • Completion of parkway prior to an overall system design 	<u>PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLES</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design with safe crossing for pedestrians / bikes • Connectivity (walkovers / walkunders) • Pedestrian / Bike access / connectivity along and across roadways • Does not hinder bikes / pedestrians access • Preserve / expand trail networks • Keep city and neighborhood connected to park
<u>SAFETY</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe for traffic • Safety • Safety • Safety – autos, people, wildlife 	

Project Issue Discussions

The group participated in a break-out session where each discussion group selected three (3) items from a draft list of critical issues to discuss and present. The critical issues and discussion items presented by each discussion group are as follows:

Discussion Groups and their selected discussion items are as follows:

<u>Discussion Group 1 - #7, 12, 14</u> Larry Brown Barry White Richard Hollis David Stevens	<u>Discussion Group 4 - #1, 9, 10</u> Charles Rond Mike Oakes Laura Adams Steve Hill Steve Reynolds
<u>Discussion Group 2 - #2, 6, 8</u> John Dudas Gregg Elliott Gary Sharpe Keith Kirkland	<u>Discussion Group 5 - #13, 16, 19</u> Mark Stansbury Ritchie Smith Randy Graves Bob Kennedy Wain Gaskins
<u>Discussion Group 3 - #5, 11, 17</u> Martha Lott Nisha Powers Ted Fox Brad Corey Larry Jensen Marty Lipinski	

Below is a summary of discussion points resulting from each group's discussions:

Discussion Group 1:

7. *Identify potential non-transportation-related issues that may arise during the course of the CSS Process and a plan of action to address each of them.*

Issues

- Accessibility to park and transportation system in Shelby County for physically disabled / handicapped individuals; integrate design for multipurpose use on the front end
- Impact of (or to) surrounding community and neighborhoods; will the project bring people together or will they be separated; address during public involvement process

Plan of action

- Political approval process; include decision makers throughout process to avoid possible litigation
- Access into the park and crossing the roadways for bicyclists and pedestrians
- This route will not be encouraged as an alternate route for the Interstate system; incorporate design features into this route such as stop signs / speed bumps to accommodate slower traffic speeds
- Keep the SFP Advisory Team active and engaging participants throughout the project, from beginning to the end (June 26, 2006)

12. *What are some environmental land mines that could slow the process down and how can they be avoided?*

Land mines

- Stream and wetlands impacts (permitting issues)

Avoidance measures

- Make sure that the environmental studies for the existing EIS are valid and the area within the corridor for this section of the project has already been studied.
- Need for multi-agency approval and coordination – streamlining process

14. *Define a methodology to maximize the benefit from public hearings without impeding progress on the CSS Process.*

- HOLD them (Public Meetings)
- Widely publicize them (flyers, public radio, newspaper, web site, advertisements, report in newspaper before and after)
- Document information received and assimilate data
- Shelby Farms Parkway Advisory Team considers it as part of solution

Discussion Group 2:

2. ***Develop a process that will be used to measure how well the Team is working, who should do the evaluation and how often it should be done. This is a critically important activity for successful partnerships.***
 - Periodic confidential surveys
 - Clearly defined goals
 - Independent third party overview
 - Consultant give team an overview of process steps / agenda (3 steps) / goals for each meeting
 - Spokesperson for team
 - Procedure for communicating to outside community

6. ***List critical issues almost sure to come up on this project that could create team disagreements and list some action steps now to achieve a win-win solution to each down the road.***
 - Number of lanes
 - Purpose of road
 - Aesthetics
 - Interchanges / intersections

8. ***What are some possible communication barriers which may exist between Shelby County, the City of Memphis, other agencies, the Resource Team, and the consulting team that need to be removed for this Partnership to succeed? Name two actions to remove each barrier listed.***
 - Lack of trust
 - Conflicting goals
 - Clarify goals – joint presentation
 - Support Resource Team throughout process
 - Accept team recommendations
 - Secure full support of process by City and County

Discussion Group 3:

5. ***Develop a Conflict Resolution Ladder for the team.***
 - Identify the positions / conflicts – hear out
 - Attempt to resolve through discussion with help from facilitator during meeting
 - If unable to resolve, table / park for the moment; allow some time to pass
 - Provide environment conducive for listening with spirit of compromise or collaborate
 - Attempt to reach common ground
 - Identify differences in positions
 - Must build consensus – no voting or majority rules attitude
 - Bring in third party for mediator and accept their decision

During the course of discussions for this issue, the importance of bringing new information to the table whenever necessary was noted. The importance of open and frequent

communication was discussed as a means of minimizing potential conflicts and in facilitating resolution of conflicts.

11. *What are various possible uses of high technology by the team during the CSS Process that may not have been considered?*

- Ability to provide input (real-time) during meeting – example: traffic simulation
- Create environment to develop trust with information / data that is provided; for example, have a subcommittee to “true” the data
- Identify source of data
- Identify methods of simulating conditions – “dynamic visualizations”

17. *How do we maintain effective communications between official meetings?*

- Project web site with chat room
- Allow opportunity for public to be involved and provide input
- Protect information such that committee / team can communicate separately (password)
- Distribution list for team to email each other
- Provide directory of team and contact information on web site

Discussion Group 4:

1. *What action steps should Shelby County, the City of Memphis, the Resource Team, and the consultants take on this project so that other stakeholders not at the resource team meetings feel they are part of the process? This issue should consider how to ensure that all parties remain committed to the process.*

- Press releases
- Web site
- Email lists
- Flyers for special events
- Public officials – mayors, TDOT representatives
- Newsletters

Commitment

- Ideas are heard
- Progress – milestones

9. *List any habits that agencies, design firms and local citizens groups often have which do not show a spirit of cooperation, inhibit timely decision making and should be avoided on this project. These lists should help to expedite the decision making process.*

- Inflexibility – won’t compromise
- Turf issue (“My Road”, “My Park”)
- Mistrust – dismissive attitude
- Lack of candor
- Misinformation / unclear communication
- Conflicting expectations
- Unclear assumptions
- Resistance to new ideas

10. *How does the team assure a consistent single message to the media and the public? Develop a process to deal with controversy if it develops.*

- Single spokesperson

Discussion Group 5:

13. *What special considerations need to be given to traffic requirements of heavy commercial trucks and various emergency vehicles (PD, FD and EMS)?*

- Number of lanes
- Cross-section (urban vs. rural)
- Turn lanes
- Signs & markings
- Lighting
- Enforcement
- Animals crossing road
- Intersection / interchange design
- Sight distance at decision points
- Landscape plantings maintenance
- Consider restricting or prohibiting specific types of vehicles (heavy trucks) from traveling on Shelby Farms Parkway

16. *How do we balance regional mobility and local access?*

- Vehicle access to Shelby Farms (parking)
- Non-motorized crossings (underpasses)
- Multi-use paths (bike and/or pedestrian)
- Add bike routes to regional bike plan
- Potential “gateway” entrances

19. *What size area should be evaluated for traffic flow? What assumptions should be included in traffic forecasting?*

Area to be considered

- I-240 / I-40 / Macon / Dexter / Germantown Parkway / Humphries

Assumptions for traffic forecasting

- Laneage
- Design speed
- Growth rates
- Acceptable level of service (LOS)
- Delay / node connections

The current traffic forecasting model that will be used for this project is for the year 2026 and assumes construction of projects planned out to the year 2026.

Goals

The Team reviewed and discussed a list of draft project goals taken from other CSS project Teams. The Shelby Farms Parkway Advisory Team chose the portions of those goals they felt were best applied to this project and rewrote many to match their collective vision. The following is a list of both Team Goals and Project Goals that the Team reached consensus on:

Team Goals

1. Achieve Community consensus and build public trust.
2. Reach consensus for a context sensitive solution in a timely fashion.
3. Adhere to a continuous and responsive public involvement process.
4. Maintain the spirit of teamwork throughout the project.
5. Create an atmosphere of good communication among the team, government, and the community.

Project Goals

1. Create a road that enhances and embraces the park.
2. Create a design concept that is socially, economically, and environmentally responsible.
3. Create a safe and effective roadway design.
4. Reduce corridor congestion.
5. Produce an excellent design that enhances the quality of life in the community.
6. Create the opportunity for non-vehicular traffic to enter and use the park.
7. Create the opportunity for vehicular and non-vehicular crossing of the corridor including access for the physically challenged.

Other Discussions

The group also discussed the proposed first Public Workshop that was tentatively scheduled for March 24, 2005 and “brainstormed” to identify a list of “similar projects” that could be used by the Resource Team in evaluating options and opportunities for this project. A summary of these discussions follows:

Public Workshops

The Resource Team requested that the Consultant facilitate a “30-Minute” Debriefing after the Public Workshop to ensure effective communication of issues identified at the Public Workshop. Information discussed at the “30-Minute” debriefing also will be beneficial in preparation of any press releases to follow the Public Workshop.

It also was discussed that information included in displays at the Public Workshop should include a listing of Resource Team members. It was further discussed that an “interview” form similar to that used in initial contacts with the Resource Team should be prepared and distributed at the Public Workshop in order to identify critical issues and concerns for the public at large. Aerial photographs showing the study area without any proposed alignments should be provided as displays at the Public Workshop.

The Resource Team asked the Consultant to provide them with drafts of flyers and notifications of the Public Workshop in advance of their distribution and publication.

Similar Projects

The Resource Team also “brainstormed” about similar projects that might be considered as resource information for the CSS process for this project. Projects identified in the “brainstorming” session included:

- Merritt Parkway, Connecticut
- Paris Pike, Kentucky
- North-East-South Parkway, Memphis, Tennessee
- Riverside Drive, Memphis, Tennessee
- Humphreys Boulevard, Memphis, Tennessee
- Rock Creek Parkway, Washington, D.C.
- Bronx River Parkway and Reservation, Westchester County, New York
- Natchez Trace, Mississippi and Tennessee
- Central Park, New York City, New York
- Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, California